

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
ABERDEEN DIVISION**

**CHARLES SMITH, JR.**

**PETITIONER**

**v.**

**No. 1:17CV184-GHD-DAS**

**MR. RONALD KING, ET AL.**

**RESPONDENTS**

**Consolidated With**

**CHARLES SMITH, JR.**

**PETITIONER**

**v.**

**No. 1:19CV117-GHD-DAS**

**RONALD KING, ET AL.**

**RESPONDENTS**

**CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The court has entered a final judgment in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a state court under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, and the court, considering the record in the case and the requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), finds that, for the reasons stated in its opinion, the Petitioner has failed to “demonstrate that the issues are debatable among jurists of reason; that a court could resolve issues in a different manner; or that the questions are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n.4, 103 S.Ct. 3383, 3394 n.4, 77 L.Ed.2d 1090 (1993) (superseded by statute) (citations and quotations omitted); 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) (1) and (2). Specifically, the court finds, for the reasons set forth in its memorandum opinion and final judgment, that the instant petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* should be denied.

**SO ORDERED**, this, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of September, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE